

## REMARKS

In the Office Action of 4/30/2007, the Examiner rejected claims 1-20 under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Haas et al. "Personalized News Through Content Augmentation and Profiling," Proceedings of ICIP 02, Rochester, NY, Sept. 2002 (hereinafter Haas). In this Response, Applicants have canceled claims 2 and 11-20 and have added new claims 21-26. Accordingly, claims 1, 3-10, and 21-26 will be pending after entry of this Response.

### I. IDS of May 18, 2004

In the Office Action, the Examiner stated that page 3 of the IDS of May 18, 2004 was not submitted and would not be considered. Applicants submit that the page 3 of the IDS of May 18, 2004 was blank and did not contain any references for consideration by the Examiner.

### II. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102

In the Office Action of 4/30/2007, the Examiner rejected claims 1-20 under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Haas. Claims 11-20 have been canceled making rejection of these claims moot. Applicants have amended claim 1, and as the rejection might be applied to the amended claim, respectfully traverse. Claim 1 recites a method for implementing a user interface on a client device, the method comprising:

coupling said host computer device, said client device, and at least one target device through a wireless network;

operating an application program on a host computer device, said application program comprising an underlying user interface to control at least one target device;

transmitting, from said host computer device to a client device, an identification of at least one scene, said scene defines an abstract layout for at least one screen display of said user interface;

generating at least one screen display for said scene based on an interpretation of said scene at said client device;

displaying, on said client device, said screen display of said user interface; receiving input, at said client device, from a user to initiate at least one operation at said target device; and

performing said operation at said target device in response to control from

said client device, wherein said target device comprises a media player.  
[Emphasis added.]

Haas discloses a set-top box for receiving information from a television broadcast station and the Internet for showing on a display (*see* Figures 2 and 3). Haas, however, does not disclose, teach, or even suggest coupling said host computer device, said client device, and at least one target device through a wireless network, displaying, on said client device, a screen display of a user interface, receiving user input, at the client device, and performing the operation at the target device, wherein said target device comprises a media player.

The Examiner indicates that the television broadcast station of Haas corresponds to the host device of claim 1 and the set-top box of Haas corresponds to the client device of claim 1. The Examiner also seems to indicate that the client device also includes the display in Haas (since claim 1 requires that the client device display the screen display of the user interface). However, Haas does not teach or suggest receiving input at the client device to initiate an operation at a target device, and performing the operation at the target device, wherein said target device comprises a media player. The Examiner has indicated that the set-top box and display of Haas corresponds to the client device but has not indicated which device in Haas corresponds to a target device that is controlled by the user interface (as required in claim 1).

Further, no where in Haas is it taught or suggested that the host computer device, client device, and the target device are coupled through a wireless network. In Haas, the television broadcast station is not taught or suggested to be coupled to the set-top box through a wireless network. Further, it is simply not known in the art for television broadcast stations to send programming media to subscriber homes through use of a wireless network. Also, since Haas does not teach or suggest the target device of claim 1, Haas also does not teach or suggest coupling the

target device, host device, and client device through a wireless network.

For the above reasons, Applicants submit that claim 1 is in allowable form. Claims 3-10 are dependent upon claim 1, and thus are allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

### **III. New Claims**

In this response, Applicants have added claims 21-26. New claims 21-22 are dependent on claim 1 and allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

New independent claim 23 recites a method for implementing a user interface on a client device remote from a host device, the method comprising:

- operating an application program on a host device, said application program comprising an underlying user interface;
- transmitting, from said host device to a client device, an identification of at least one scene, said scene defines an abstract layout for at least one screen display of said user interface;
- generating at least one screen display for said scene based on an interpretation of said scene at said client device;
- displaying, on said client device, said screen display of said user interface;
- receiving a first user input, at said client device, to initiate a first operation at a first target device, said first target device comprising a video media player;
- performing said first operation at said first target device;
- receiving a second user input, at said client device, to initiate a second operation at a second target device, said second target device comprising an audio media player; and
- performing said second operation at said second target device.

Applicants submit that Haas does not disclose, teach, or even suggest each limitation of new claim 23. For example, Haas does not teach or suggest a client device for receiving a user input to initiate an operation at a first target device comprising a video media player and receiving a user input to initiate an operation at a second target device comprising an audio media player. For the above reasons, Applicants submit that claim 23 is in allowable form. New claims 24-26 are dependent upon claim 23, and thus are allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 23.

## CONCLUSION

Based on the foregoing remarks, Applicants believe that the application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner has any questions regarding the case, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative at the number given below.

Respectfully submitted,

STATTLER-SUH PC

Dated: 8/13/07

/G Suh/ #48,187

Gregory Suh  
Reg. No. 48,187

Statler-Suh PC  
60 South Market Street, Suite 480  
San Jose, CA 95113  
Phone: (408) 881-0140 ext.104  
Fax: (408) 881-0145